



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The expression of public opinion, of the religious, educated and thinking people, has gone on increasing from shore to shore in every quarter of the land. The nation has practically uttered itself in one great voice. And yet these men in the senate set themselves up as wiser than all the people, than all the distinguished scholars, publicists, jurists and statesmen in the nation at large who have examined the treaty and declared it to be an ably drawn, wise, safe and thoroughly practicable measure. We do not know how much strength the opposition will be able to keep up after the fourth of March. We do not believe it will be anything like sufficient to defeat the treaty, which is certain to gain friends the longer it is considered and discussed. Many of the senators who have conjured up all sorts of extraordinary objections and tried to amend or to talk the measure to death, will not care to record their votes against it when the final hour comes. There is no harm to be feared from the delay, in itself. We have never objected and do not now object to the most thorough and ample consideration of all the details of the convention. Many of the warmest friends of the convention in the senate have plead for time for proper examination. We do not think there is any ground for alarm on the part of the friends of arbitration, either in this country or Great Britain, as to the ultimate fate of the treaty. It is mortifying, of course, that it has had to meet the sort of obstacles thrown in its way, but it will in the end come out all the stronger and more triumphant therefor. If such a calamity as its defeat should occur, even then the cause of arbitration will not be in the least put back. It is safe to say that the movement for general arbitration has never gained in strength so rapidly as in the last two months. In due time this increased strength will show itself in the United States senate as well as elsewhere.

THE VENEZUELA TRIBUNAL.

The Anglo-Venezuelan arbitration treaty, formed on the model of the Anglo-American treaty touching the subject given in a former number of the *ADVOCATE*, was signed at Washington on the 2d of February by Sir Julian Pauncefote and the Venezuelan Minister, Senor Jose Andrade. The signing took place in Secretary Olney's office between four and five o'clock in the afternoon. The British Ambassador was attended by Mr. H. O. Bax-Ironside, Secretary of the British Legation; Minister Andrade by Manuel M. Ponto, Jr., secretary of legation, and James J. Storrow, the counsel of Venezuela.

After the two plenipotentiaries had exchanged their credentials, and the two printed (in English) copies of the treaty had been carefully examined by Mr. Bax-Ironside and Mr. Cridler, chief of the Diplomatic Bureau, the plenipotentiaries each signed both of the copies, and Mr. Cridler affixed their respective seals. The signing

was done with a magnificent pen which Senor Andrade's brother had sent to him from Venezuela for the occasion. It was a gold pen, fastened in a holder made from the quill of an eagle, bearing midway a gold heart thickly encrusted with diamonds. After the signing there was a general exchange of congratulations, those given to Secretary Olney being particularly hearty on account of the prominent part which he had taken in bringing about the agreement.

This treaty practically brings to an end a controversy which has been going on for three quarters of the century, which involved the State Department of the United States in much diplomatic correspondence covering more than twenty years, which finally resulted in complete diplomatic estrangement between Great Britain and Venezuela, and brought on fourteen months ago the worst war fever that has attacked our country since the Alabama incident. If such a controversy as this, involving as it did a large area of disputed territory claimed with absolute confidence by both parties and closely touching their honor, can be submitted to an arbitration tribunal with certainty that a fair and honorable solution will be reached, we are unable to see why any question of international controversy can reasonably be kept back from the jurisdiction of arbitration tribunals. This is the position to which all thinking people will rapidly come. The idea of reserving a lot of questions as unarbitrable is a survival of the arbitrariness of the wild man unwilling to have his liberty at all restricted. Civilization is getting the better of the wild man, though a good many people still retain traces of the forest.

The treaty signed on the 2d ult. names the arbitrators for the case. They are for Venezuela, Chief Justice Fuller and Justice Brewer of the United States Supreme Court, for Great Britain, Lord Herschel, formerly Lord High Chancellor of England, and Sir Richard Henn Collins, a justice of the Queen's bench division of the British High Court of Judicature. They are to meet within six months from the date of ratification of the treaty and choose an umpire for the tribunal. In case they fail to select an umpire, King Oscar of Sweden is empowered by the treaty to make the selection.

We shall await with great interest the meeting of this distinguished tribunal, the personnel of which is a sufficient guaranty that if there is a "true divisional line" between Venezuela and British Guiana, they will be able to find it.

THE OUTGOING PRESIDENT.

When this number of the *ADVOCATE* reaches our readers, Grover Cleveland will have retired from the presidency of the United States into private life. We are not proposing to write a eulogium on him, or to undertake any extended critical analysis of his character and

career. This would be a long study and not at all an easy one. We cannot, however, let the occasion of his retirement pass without a word in reference to that aspect of his administration which bears directly upon the subject for whose promotion this paper stands.

The policy which Mr. Cleveland has followed in the foreign relations of the government, whatever criticism may be given upon certain aspects of it, has been on the whole the true American policy of peacefulness, friendly neutrality and non-interference. He has pursued this policy in an independent and original way, but with what has seemed to us thorough conscientiousness, honesty and devotion to fairness and justice, as well as to high ideals of international obligation.

Even his course in reference to Hawaii, which was the subject of so much aspersion and ridicule, has certainly done no harm either to that country or this. If annexation should ever come, it will certainly come under much more favorable circumstances and with much greater understanding of the subject by our people, because of the policy of delay and consideration which he forced the country to pursue. His course in reference to the influence of the United States in bringing about the deposition of the Queen of Hawaii was one dictated, we have not the least doubt, by a genuine spirit of fairness and not in the least by a truckling to monarchical institutions, which was absurdly charged against him.

The past eighteen months have been a period of exceptional perplexity and delicacy in our foreign relations, and of unusual excitement and restlessness at home in respect to them. During this time the Armenian troubles, the Venezuelan and the Cuban difficulties have followed closely one upon another, or rather been all on hand together. It seems almost miraculous that, with the clamoring of jingo politicians, the vehement denunciations of religious enthusiasts and would-be knight-errants of liberty, and the legitimate demands of offended right and justice, we have passed this trying period without a rupture somewhere. That we have done so is due to the retiring president's independence, thorough honesty and patient adherence to what he believed to be right, regardless of praise or blame. A purely party president, Democrat or Republican, or one unsettled in his own convictions and easily moved by public clamor, would almost certainly have brought us into open conflict with Turkey, Great Britain, and later with Spain, with all the desolating evils which wars with these countries would have involved. How easy it would have been for Mr. Cleveland, after the message of December 17 1895, to have taken advantage of the flame of war-feeling which he had, it seems unintentionally, kindled, and hurried the country into war with Great Britain, if he had chosen to follow a less wise and conciliatory course in choosing the members of the Venezuela Commission!

The same candidness and straightforwardness which had brought on the trouble, has delivered the country from its possible evil results and brought about greater unity between the two nations than has ever existed before.

The possible disasters which might have come from all these international complications President Cleveland has not only averted, but he has finally brought the country as a whole to acquiesce in the wisdom and rightness of the policy of patient forbearance and considerateness which he has followed, and it is now understood that, as a matter of course, his successor will follow in the same path, the only one worthy of a man exalted to the chief magistracy of a great nation of peace-loving citizens. The country may have suffered wrong in particular cases, but how much wiser and more Christian to have patiently endured this than to have run the risk and incurred the guilt of bringing upon us the unnumbered woes and sufferings and desolations of war. Our credit for peaceful attention to our own business has suffered enough as things have gone, but if all the clamors which have been heard for vengeance upon Turkey and Spain, and for kicking England summarily out of the New World, had been heeded, our national reputation for peacefulness, fairness and good sense would have been utterly gone and our power to promote the Christian progress of the world ruined.

President Cleveland has deserved and will carry with him into private life the sincere respect and high regard of all the friends of peace, regardless of party, and they will wish him yet many years of life in which to serve his country and humanity in the effective ways that will always be open to him.

ENGLISH TEACHING OF AMERICAN HISTORY.

The United States Commissioner of Education, in his Report for 1894-95, just out, has incorporated an interesting chapter on English methods of teaching American history. The chapter is No. XLIV of the Report, and contains extracts from twenty-four books of English history used in the schools of the lower grades. These histories were collected by Mr. Samuel Plimsoll, well known for his philanthropic efforts in behalf of sailors, with a view to show the better spirit found in the English school histories compared with our own. Mr. Plimsoll, during the last two years has been making special effort, along with many others, to promote greater good feeling between the United States and Great Britain. In pursuance of this purpose he has been making an inquiry into the method and spirit of history-teaching in the elementary schools of the two countries. While on a visit to this country a year ago he made a special examination of the history books used in the schools of the United States, and was very much struck with the dislike of England exhibited in them, and sure to be imbibed from them by the boys and girls in the schools.